

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

### *Claim Objections*

Claims 1-20 were objected to because of the following informalities and/or defects:

Claims 1, 5, 10 and 15 each recite the terms of “lateral size,” but fail to clarify which direction is the direction of the recited lateral size, as a 2-D has at least two different directions along its edges. The generally accepted definition of ‘lateral’ is “of or pertaining to the side; situated at, proceeding from, or directed to a side” (Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary 2005).

Applicants believe that the claim is sufficient to define that the lateral size is the size from one side of the fuse bank to the other, but have amended the claims to further define that lateral is in the direction of the first direction. In claim 10, line 17, the term of “each includes” has been amended to read ‘includes.’ Claims 15 and 18 have been amended to clarify the direction of each of the fuse regions. Claims 19 and 20 have been amended to clarify the relationship(s) between the first and second fuses and the fuse regions already recited in claim 18. It is therefore submitted that these amendments overcome the objections to the claims and withdrawal of these rejections is requested.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112*

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The amendments made to the claims above have more specifically pointed out the relationship between the pitch and the lateral size of the fuse region. It is therefore submitted that this rejection has been overcome and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102*

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yoon (KR 2001-0029286 (Application No. 99-42035), June 2001; of record).

The office action states, “it is noted that the recited term ‘directly proportional’ may be interpreted as having some potentially implicated process limitations regarding whether other

fuse banks with different lateral sizes and pitches between the connecting lines are also made along with the above discussed fuse bank...”

Regardless, the Examiner has failed to address the limitation in the previously filed amendment as to where Yoon teaches this limitation as to the ‘final product.’ There is no mention of process limitations in the claims, and Applicant views the discussion of ‘implicated process limitations’ as being irrelevant. It is the features of the fuse banks as they are laid out that are of relevance here.

In order for the Yoon reference to be a valid reference under 35 USC 102, it must teach each and every limitation of the claims. Nowhere in the office action is it stated how Yoon teaches that the limitation of ‘directly proportional to’ is taught, much less the current limitation of claim 1, *the lateral size in the first direction is directly proportional to a number of fuses times a pitch between the connecting line regions of the first and second laser fuses*, or, *the lateral size in the first direction is directly proportional to a number of fuses times a pitch between the connecting line regions of the laser fuses*, as in claim 5. It appears from the text of Yoon, which is in Korean, that the relationship is far different, see Yoon pages 2 and 3.

It appears that the relationship in Yoon is based upon a pitch between fuses. The pitch between the connecting lines is smaller than the pitch between the fuses. Therefore, Yoon’s lateral size increases more than the lateral size of the invention as claimed. Therefore, the lateral size of the invention as claimed lateral size is different from Yoon’s. Yoon fails to disclose the feature of the present invention. Accordingly, the Examiner’s rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

It is therefore submitted that claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 9 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103*

Claims 3, 4, 7, 8 and 10-20, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoon in view of AAPA (Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art) and/or Sakuta (Sakuta, et al., US 5,208,782).

As discussed above, Yoon does not teach the relationship between the pitch distance and the lateral size as was previously filed, much less the relationship, “*a lateral size of the fuse bank in the first direction is substantially equal to a number of fuses minus one times a pitch between*

*the connecting lines of the first and second laser fuses plus the number of fuses times the width of the first connecting line plus the length of the fusing region.”* The addition of Sakuta to this combination does nothing to cure this deficiency. The office action never addresses the relationship between pitch distance and lateral size.

It is therefore submitted that claims 3, 4, 7, 8 and 10-20, which have been amended to include the above clarification, or depend from a claim that has been so amended, are patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-20 of the application as amended is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



---

Julie L. Reed  
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.  
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400  
Portland, OR 97204  
503-222-3613

**Customer No. 20575**